

# SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS, MAY 21, 2013

---

## Agenda Items without Formal Action

Item	Follow-up Actions
Item 1: Management Reports	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 2: Salmon Recovery Management Reports	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 3: Reports from Partners	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 4: Federal Ruling on Tribal Culvert Case	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 5: Update on the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Region	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 6: Budget Update	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 8: Monitoring Program Findings & Results	There were no follow-up actions.

## Agenda Items with Formal Action

Item	Formal Action	Follow-up Actions
Minutes	<a href="#">Approved</a> Minutes from September 2012	There were no follow-up actions.
Item 7: Project, Lead Entity, and Regional Organization Funding Allocation Decisions	<a href="#">Deferred funding decisions</a> and direct the chair to call a special meeting via conference call once budgets are authorized.	Chair to call a special meeting via conference call for future funding decisions.
Item 9: Contract Awards for Ongoing Monitoring Programs	<a href="#">Approved</a> \$217,000 from 2012 PCSRF funds to continue the existing project effectiveness program with TetraTech through April 1, 2014.  <a href="#">Fully funded the intensively monitored watersheds</a> through 2013 field season, pending receipt of PCSRF funds for federal fiscal year 2013, and subject to review in October, and delegated authority to director to negotiate an appropriate contract.	Staff to present findings of monitoring assessment in October.

# **SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES**

---

**Date:** May 21, 2013

**Place:** Olympia, WA

## **Salmon Recovery Funding Board Members Present:**

<b>David Troutt, Chair</b>	Olympia	<b>Jennifer Quan</b>	Department of Fish and Wildlife
<b>Josh Brown</b>	Kitsap County	<b>Carol Smith</b>	Conservation Commission
<b>Phil Rockefeller</b>	NWPCC	<b>Megan Duffy</b>	Department of Natural Resources
<b>Nancy Biery</b>	Jefferson County	<b>Mike Barber</b>	Department of Transportation
<b>Harry Barber</b>	Washougal		

---

**It is intended that this summary be used with the notebook provided in advance of the meeting. A recording is retained by RCO as the formal record of meeting.**

## **Opening and Welcome**

Chair David Troutt called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and a quorum was determined. New members Nancy Biery and Megan Duffy introduced themselves.

**Josh Brown moved to adopt the agenda.**

**Seconded by:** Phil Rockefeller

**Motion:** APPROVED

**Phil Rockefeller moved to adopt the February 2013 minutes.**

**Seconded by:** Josh Brown

**Motion:** APPROVED

## **Service Recognition: Donald R. "Bud" Hover**

Chair Troutt read the resolution and thanked Hover for his service as a board member and as board chairman. Other members also shared their thanks, memories, and good wishes.

**Josh Brown moved to approve service resolution #2013-02.**

**Seconded by:** Phil Rockefeller

**Motion:** APPROVED

## **Proposed August Meeting Date**

**Josh Brown moved to approve August 22, 2013 for regular meeting via conference call**

**Seconded by:** Harry Barber

**Motion:** APPROVED



### **Item 1: Management Reports**

Director Cottingham stated that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) informed her that the state will receive a \$20 million PCSRF grant for federal fiscal year 2013. This is less than previous awards and the amount requested. She does not have details about where the cuts will need to be taken.

Nona Snell gave an update on the special legislative session, which began on May 13, noting that she would give more information about budget later in the day. She reviewed HB 1194, which passed during legislative session. Director Cottingham noted that they do not expect any other bills to come forward during special session that affect the board.

### **Item 2: Salmon Recovery Management Reports**

Brian Abbott reviewed the 2013 grant round, noting that site visits are underway and they are using the PRISM online application for the first time. The system is capturing more information and ensuring greater accuracy. The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office is working on a strategic plan, and is nearly ready to submit a draft to the director. He reviewed the work plan for the monitoring assessment strategy, which was submitted on May 17 and incorporated into the board materials.

The salmon recovery conference had 626 attendees. He thanked Sarah Gage, the conference coordinator, as well as the salmon staff, presenter, and presentation moderators. They are currently conducting a survey of participants.

The board viewed the salmon video that was created to supplement the State of the Salmon report.

### **Projects of Note**

Marc Duboiski presented two projects of note from the Upper Columbia region: the Dillwater Large Woody Debris Enhancement on the Entiat River (10-1843) and the Poorman Creek Barrier Removal on the Twisp River (08-1985).

### **Item 3: Reports from Partners**

**Council of Regions:** Jeff Breckel noted that Julie Morgan had left the Upper Columbia Region. In addition, the regions are looking at the effects of potential budget cuts on their programs. They are working with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and Department of Natural Resources on better communication and priority setting. They are engaged with GSRO on the monitoring assessment strategy as members of the steering committee.

**Lead Entity Advisory Group:** Cheryl Baumann noted that the lead entity coordinators are busy helping project sponsors with the grant round. Many of them were at the project conference. They also had a training conference in April, where they did considerable work on strategic planning for the advisory group. They are focused on an update of their mission and goals, enhanced information exchange among lead entities (e.g., idea sharing, business solutions), and long-term funding. The committees working on those topics already have been meeting. LEAG will meet again in June to set short term goals.

**Conservation Commission:** Carol Smith noted that various versions of the budget have only modest cuts for the Conservation Commission, so they are hopeful. The federal Office of Management and Budget recently took action made funding available for the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). They had been on hold since October 1 when the Farm Bill expired, even though legislation was passed

exempting the program. Two counties may receive funding to develop plans for the Voluntary Stewardship Program.

**Northwest Power Council:** Phil Rockefeller noted that the solicitation for input on the update to Power Council's *Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program* is underway and will continue through July 19.

**Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW):** Jennifer Quan discussed the trip back to Washington DC. They had good conversations hatchery, harvest reform, and habitat; many of their private and tribal partners were there. She reiterated the need to continue to tell the story of all-H integration in the salmon recovery story.

WDFW is restructuring the watershed stewards program so that there is more generalized expertise; they will do a careful transition so that there is better integration within their agency.

**Department of Natural Resources:** Megan Duffy noted that three pieces of agency legislation were passed during session and will be signed by the Governor. She highlighted details of the derelict vessel removal program bill. For the budget, they have some concerns for some programs, including Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans (RMAPs), but the aquatic program fared well in the proposed budgets.

**Department of Transportation:** Mike Barber reported that the budget includes about \$35 million for fish passage. This summer, they have about 20 projects moving forward. They have another \$25 million to correct two chronic environmental deficiency projects; construction will start in 2014.

#### **General Public Comment**

There was no general public comment.

#### **Item 4: Federal Ruling on Tribal Culvert Case**

Brian Abbott noted that there was an overview in the memo.

David Troutt offered the tribal perspective, noting that he was presenting as a representative of the Nisqually Tribe, not as the board chair. He reported that the tribes were pleased with the decision, and that the courts have said there have to be fish, therefore it is appropriate that salmon must have habitat. The tribes made the case that fish were losing habitat faster than it was being restored. The amount of funding is substantial, but can be budgeted. They are mitigations for actions in the past. Troutt stated that this is a focused case, and noted that the general preference is not to litigate, but rather to work together to find and implement solutions.

Brian Abbott noted that this case is specific to the treaty tribes in Western Washington, and that it does not address other barriers on state, federal, and private land across the state.

Member Brown stated that he is frustrated because there are opportunities for collaboration and partnership. He gave an example from Kitsap County where they are working with the Suquamish Tribe to remove a barrier on Chico Creek. If there is not a concerted focus to address maintenance and issues such as barriers, no one does it.

**Department of Transportation:** Megan White, Director, Environmental Services, reviewed the presentation provided in board materials about the Department of Transportation (DOT) actions to



replace barriers. Work is already underway. She noted that the ruling requires that they use a specific approach. They have had a program in place since the 1990s to replace the barriers; the ruling puts it on a more aggressive timeline. The overall plan will cost \$2.4 billion. In this biennium, they will focus on design and scoping so that they increase the pace of corrections in future biennia. They are looking at ways to improve their approach so they can implement the projects more efficiently. The \$20 million requested to expedite the work was approved by the Governor on May 20.

In response to a question from Member Rockefeller, Member Mike Barber noted that there are about 700 barriers outside the case area. White noted that some work is being done on those barriers, and they are trying to have the legislature not forget about the barrier outside the case area, but they may not be able to address those barriers while they focus in the case area.

Brown asked about prioritization and communication with cities and counties in situations where a state-owned culvert may be surrounded by local or private property or culverts. He stated that he was concerned about the litigation driving outcomes that are not the highest priorities, and having that decrease the political will and funding. White responded that they work with WDFW, and the ruling requires them to use habitat as the focal point for prioritization. Further, they are guided by the principle of opening up the greatest amount of habitat in the shortest amount of time. They want to work with others to share information.

Member H. Barber asked how they manage maintenance after the culvert is replaced so that new blockages are not created. White responded that they have an active maintenance program.

**Department of Natural Resources:** Member Duffy presented the slides from the board materials. DNR has 87 barriers remaining in the case area. She noted that DNR is moving ahead to meet the obligation by 2016, but needs to find at least \$3.4 million in additional funding; the stream simulation required by the ruling may increase that figure. Member Rockefeller referred to funding slide and asked why Bonneville funds were used. Liz Klumpp, Bonneville Power, was seated in the audience and explained they had shared access roads on DNR land.

**Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW):** Jennifer Quan presented the slides from the board materials, noting that they are fixing culverts in the case area and RMAP areas. There are 23 culverts in the case area, 16 are nearly complete. They prioritized fixing the culverts in the capital budget. Their concern includes the ongoing monitoring cost.

**State Parks:** Larry Fairleigh, Assistant Director of State Parks, noted that they have 72 blockages in the case area. Of those, fifty affect salmon, but only 16 are on roads. The rest are on trails. They will address seven in 2013, four were included in the 2013-15 budget request. They have asked for funding for the remaining five.

#### **Item 5: Update on the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Region**

Derek Van Marter, Associate Director, and James White, Program Manager, presented information about activity in the Upper Columbia region. Van Marter gave an overview of the region, including their mission statement, listed species, recovery plan, and adaptive management framework. He and James White explained their four main programs:

- Project Selection and Funding;
- Science and Integrated Recovery Reporting;

- Forest Health; and
- Internal Operations.

They focus on collaborative efforts and wise resource management to achieve the goals in the recovery plans through these programs. White explained the significant work they are doing to share and use scientific information to improve projects through the adaptive management cycle. They also have sought to diversify funding in all of their programs, leveraging board funds with other public sources, tribal support, and private foundation monies. Van Marter noted that their ongoing challenges include stewardship to protect investments, clear roles, and integrated recovery. Van Marter concluded by reviewed the progress they are making, as indicated by data about the abundance of specific populations.

Board members noted that the Upper Columbia is on the cutting edge for the use of science and adaptive management, and thanked them for their leadership.

### **Item 6: Budget Update**

Nona Snell and Brian Abbott reviewed the information provided in the staff memo. Snell noted that the special session is scheduled to end June 11, and the next revenue forecast is due June 18. She hopes that the budget is completed by June 30.

Since the publication of the memo, the only new information is regarding NOAA funding. Snell noted that NOAA had informed the RCO verbally that the state would receive only \$20 million in 2013 PCSRF funds, rather than the \$25 million requested. Director Cottingham noted that specific reductions for habitat grants and capacity funding are unknown at this time.

Member Biery asked if there was any outreach to try to change the award for 2013. Director Cottingham responded that it was a competitive grant. Member Quan noted that the outreach happens as the budget is developed, and they are seeking to increase the amount above \$50 million for federal fiscal year 2014.

### **Item 7: Project, Lead Entity, and Regional Organization Funding Allocation Decisions**

Brian Abbott, Section Manager, noted that there were no approved budgets and described the two options for the board to take. The first would be to delegate authority to the director and the second would be to set a special meeting for decisions. He reviewed the briefing memo, reminding the board that it had changed the contracts for the lead entities and regions to an annual basis. He stated that even with the reduction in PCSRF funds, the staff is not changing the recommendations in the memo.

Abbott explained that the regions had been asked to model five and ten percent reductions in their budgets and scopes of work to accommodate the lead entity budget.

Chair Troutt asked if the premise was to maintain the balance between projects, monitoring, and capacity. Abbott said that the intent was to do that, and not to take money from projects to fund capacity. Chair Troutt suggested that the proportions could be shifted, and are not dictated by NOAA, despite that agency's stated PCSRF priorities.

### **Public Comment**

Cheryl Baumann stated that the lead entity advisory group appreciated the support and recognition that the funding has remained static for thirteen years. Many lead entities operate on a part time basis. The board is faced with tough decisions, but the lead entities are very cost effective. They appreciate the effort



to maintain the status quo. Their reality is that the contracts end June 30; without a funded contract, some of them will not have a job in July. This also will affect the grant round.

Jeff Breckel said that on behalf of the regions, they appreciate the effort to maintain funding. It has been crucial to create the recovery plans and now implement them. Many of the regions also are lead entities. No one argues that the infrastructure is critical. Many of them are in a tough funding spot because other sources are drying up. Collectively, the regions are willing to work with the board and staff to make the resources work as well as possible to maintain the infrastructure.

Alex Conley questioned why the board would defer a decision, given that the net change seemed to be positive compared to the previous biennium. He stated that preserving the status quo would be a significant accomplishment.

#### Board Discussion

Member H. Barber suggested that their philosophy would not change if the numbers changed; this makes him comfortable delegating authority. Member Brown asked what would have to happen to change the recommendation. Director Cottingham responded that the proposal uses a lot of the available money, and that they would need to think about the effect on the second year of the biennium.

Chair Troutt stated that he thought that there was too much that was unknown, funding is a critical decision, and that he wanted to be involved in the decision once there was information. He leaned toward having a special session. Member H. Barber suggested that delegation of authority would work if the funding available did not change significantly from the memo assumptions. Chair Troutt clarified that his concern had more to do with the negotiation about the split of federal funds and the lack of direction from NOAA.

The board members asked for more information before the special meeting about how the funding is allocated between projects, capacity, and monitoring. Member Brown noted that he thinks it is important to find a way to keep the regions and lead entities whole.

Chair Troutt noted that the board needs the lead entities and regions to tell them at what point they can no longer leverage funds. Director Cottingham said that she was told that the high proportion of capacity funds (priority four) to project funds (priority one) made the PCSRF application less competitive. Chair Troutt said that he hoped that the formal response from NOAA was clear on that point this year because he found the direction to be vague about capacity.

Member Quan addressed the question of whether the hatchery projects were the factor that made the application less competitive. She noted that in the PCSRF application, there are four priorities. There are hatchery reform priorities in categories one and two. The projects in category two are the ones that affect the competitiveness of the state application. She was told that other states had improved their applications, while our application continued the status quo.

**Josh Brown moved to defer funding decisions and direct the chair to call a special meeting via conference call once budgets are authorized.**

**Seconded by:** Nancy Biery

**Motion:** APPROVED

### **Item 8: Monitoring Program Findings & Results**

Jennifer O'Neal presented information about findings from the Effectiveness Monitoring program funded by the board. She gave an overview of the project, reviewing the costs, categories, timeline, monitoring locations, metrics used, and how they ensure data compatibility. She then reviewed some key findings from projects regarding floodplain enhancement approaches and instream structures. She noted that projects are effective at achieving habitat outcomes, but further work needs to be done to document fish response. O'Neal also provided findings showing that some project types are more effective for specific goals and species and showed how monitoring data can be used to improve project design. She shared how the information is being shared with sponsors and the public.

She concluded the presentation by noting that there are opportunities to do more integration across programs and existing data sets so that everyone gets a better understanding of fish response to projects and habitat preferences. Doing so will maximize the investments in monitoring. It is important to develop partnerships across the state with local entities and other agencies.

Member Quan asked how they are coordinating with the Upper Columbia on protocols. O'Neal responded that they are coordinating so that the efforts are complementary. Member Quan also asked how many years of data the design would capture at a single site. O'Neal responded that the most data that they have at a single site is eight years. The question is how long it takes habitat and fish to respond; ten years is an average to give habitat and fish a chance to respond.

Member Rockefeller asked if these findings should be incorporated into Manual 18. Director Cottingham responded that the appropriate place is the Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines, which the board just helped to update. Brian Abbott explained that the guidelines provide scientific guidance for projects, and reminded the board that they are currently updating the monitoring appendix of those guidelines. Member Rockefeller suggested that the board could reduce the cost of monitoring by using this science up front to design better projects. Chair Troutt suggested that the information is being used informally now since it is available on Habitat Work Schedule.

Member Rockefeller asked if the results can be generalized from one watershed to another. O'Neal responded that the information is useful, but does not take the place of watershed-level knowledge.

### **Item 9: Contract Awards for Ongoing Monitoring Programs**

Brian Abbott noted that there are two requests described in Item 9, and reminded the board that the monitoring assessment is ongoing. There is about \$508,000 in remaining 2012 PCSRF funds; one option would be to use a portion of that to fund the TetraTech continuation. He explained the request for additional Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) funds, noting that the board had heard information about the program at previous meetings. Funding would come from the fiscal year 2013 PCSRF funds when they become available.

Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, reported that they have been unable to find additional funding for the restoration projects needed to support the IMW in the Lower Columbia. They funded two projects last year, hope to fund one this year, and will design two next year. If they continue funding the implementation element of the IMW through the regional allocation, it will take about six years to complete. Director Cottingham noted that she had heard that that PCSRF might fund a project in the IMW through the Cowlitz Tribe. Breckel confirmed that he had heard the same.



Member Rockefeller asked what level of monitoring could be done at that level of restoration. Bill Ehinger, Department of Ecology, stated that it would be hard to scale back on the monitoring and have results that make any sense. Member H. Barber asked if there was monitoring related to the carcass analog work. Ehinger responded that the analogs went in during 2010; they do not yet have results from that monitoring work. Chair Troutt asked if the monitoring could be redesigned to focus on that question. Ehinger responded that the only monitoring that could be dropped would be habitat, but even that would be difficult to do because it might be necessary in the future. Chair Troutt suggested that the board was struggling with the idea of whether the IMW could be redesigned to focus on nutrient enhancement.

Member Quan stated that the questions were (1) could they fill the project funding gap, (2) could they prioritize funding toward these priority treatment areas, and (3) is this the right time to change investments when the assessment is still outstanding?

Member Smith asked if the money is the problem, or is the problem a reticence on the part of landowners. Breckel responded that the work needs to be done on Department of Natural Resources land, so the problem is mostly money. They are talking with the private landowners who need to be involved.

Member H. Barber said he would like to see the nutrient enhancement piece driven to conclusion in the Lower Columbia IMW. Jeff Breckel agreed. The board discussed this option at length, considering the potential costs, practical considerations, impacts, timing, and continuing value of the IMW. Board members identified information that would be needed from Ecology before they could make a decision to change the focus of the IMW.

Member Duffy noted that the discussion of changing the IMW approach ignored the threshold question of whether the board wants to invest in restoration actions. She suggested that it would be better to address that question, and then think about how to change the approach for IMW. Member Quan asked for opportunity to talk to staff about habitat investments. Director Cottingham stated that the board could maintain status quo until after they hear recommendations from the board-funded assessment in October. Member Brown stated that it was a logical approach. Member Rockefeller asked if deferment gave them an opportunity to consider the funding gap for restoration. Director Cottingham responded that it spread the investment in treatments over a longer period.

Chair Troutt asked if they approved status quo funding, and then wanted to change direction after receiving the assessment, if they negotiate a change to the approach. Ehinger responded that he believed that they could. Chair Troutt stated that he thinks that getting ahead of the assessment is premature. Director Cottingham noted that the assessment would include a plan to ramp-down any monitoring that they recommended the board discontinue.

**Phil Rockefeller moved to approve \$217,000 from 2012 PCSRF funds to continue the existing project effectiveness program with TetraTech through April 1, 2014.**

**Seconded by: Harry Barber**

**Motion: APPROVED**

**Josh Brown moved to fully fund the intensively monitored watersheds through 2013 field season, pending receipt of PCSRF funds for federal fiscal year 2013, and subject to review in October, and to delegate authority to director to negotiate an appropriate contract.**

**Seconded by: Phil Rockefeller**

**Motion: APPROVED**

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes approved by:



David Troutt, Chair



Date